

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Upon entry of the amendment, claims 1-32 are pending in the application. Of these, claims 1, 14 and 21 are independent. Claims 1, 14 and 21 are sought to be amended. Applicants believe that these changes introduce no new matter. Entry and consideration of this amendment are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-2, 5-12, 21-22 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,600,573 to Hendricks et al. (“Hendricks”). Claims 4 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hendricks in view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2002/0152474 to Dudkiewicz (“Dudkiewicz”). Claims 13 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hendricks in view of Dudkiewicz and further in view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2002/0162120 to Mitchell (“Mitchell”). Claims 3, 14, 18 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hendricks in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,585 to Hendricks et al. (“Hendricks 585”). Claims 15-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hendricks in view of Hendricks 585 and further in view of Dudkiewicz. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hendricks in view of Hendricks 585 in view of Dudkiewicz and further in view of Mitchell. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections to pending claims 1-32 since

Hendricks, Dudkiewicz, Mitchell, and Hendricks 585, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of independent claims 1, 14 and 21 (and thus their dependent claims 2-13, 15-20 and 22-32) for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 14 and 21 have been amended to include a similar feature of wherein the transmission policy is based on a playout policy and one or more network resources that are available for said transmission, wherein the playout policy is a list of protocol-neutral and protocol-specific transmission settings. Applicants assert that Hendricks, Dudkiewicz, Mitchell, and Hendricks 585, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 1, 14 and 21 (and their dependent claims 2-13, 15-20 and 22-32) are patentable over Hendricks, Dudkiewicz, Mitchell, and Hendricks 585, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-0931 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of objections and rejections have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Intel Corporation

Dated: November 7, 2006

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126
Molly A. McCall
(703) 633-0931

P11540 Reply to Final OA

I, Julie Dussault, hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 7, 2006


(Signature of person mailing correspondence)